

## REMARKS

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a). Claims 1-3 have been amended in a readily apparent manner to overcome this objection. Accordingly, no correction to the drawings is believed to be required. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Yamanaka et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, because the cited reference does not disclose (or suggest) the claimed resist film having the surface ruggedness which includes continuous linear or curved convex portions that are arranged periodically.

As described in claim 1, the reflection electrodes of the present invention are formed on a resist film, which has wrinkle-form surface ruggedness arranged periodically. As a result, the reflection electrodes also have the ruggedness of the resist film.

The Yamanaka et al. reference discloses a reflector in a reflective liquid crystal display device which displays an image by reflecting external light. As shown in Fig. 1, the reflector 10 includes a residual film 13b including projecting portions 13a. The columnar portions 13a are composed into plural groups 12, as shown in Figs. 2A-2B. Yamanaka et al. teaches that to suppress interference of light which occurs due to a repetitive pattern in which the projecting and depressed structures are regularly arranged, the groups 12 of columnar portions 13a are not arranged repetitively with a given period. Thus, the polymer resin layer 14 formed on the groups 12 and composed of a resist does not have periodical ruggedness.

Accordingly, the light reflecting thin film 15 formed on the resin layer 14 also does not have periodical ruggedness. Thus, Yamanaka et al. does not disclose the resist film and reflection electrodes having the periodical ruggedness described in claim 1.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamanaka et al. in view of Miyawaki et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons given with respect to claim 1, from which claim 4 depends, and because of the additional features described in claim 4. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. The Examiner should contact Applicants' undersigned attorney if a telephone conference would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



B. Joe Kim

Registration No. 41,895

November 17, 2006

Suite 2500  
300 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 360-0080  
Customer No. 24978

P:\DOCS\1508\68672\AO0684.DOC